

Serial No. 09/766,646

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-12 and 14-26 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11-12, 14, and 21-23 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-12 and 14-26 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 4 on pages 2-17 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 and 14-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,223,215, issued to Hunt et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hunt") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0005242, issued to Hoyle (hereinafter referred to as "Hoyle") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0172343, issued to Allibhoy et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Allibhoy"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites "receiving, from the first user, designation information of a product provider which the first user permits to view the cart identification information and to view product information which the first user associates with the cart identification information, and which provides a product related to the viewed product information as well as additional information related to the viewed product information." It was shown by the Applicants in the Amendment filed on August 22, 2006, that neither Hunt nor Hoyle, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests at least this feature of claim 1. This was acknowledged by the Examiner in item 2 on page 2 of the present Office Action.

The Examiner then alleged that Allibhoy discloses a user being able to designate which content providers the user will receive further information from. In the system of Allibhoy, an ATV controller 109 only allows content providers that are authorized by the service provider, by paying advertising fees and the like, to be shown to the user (Paragraph [0069]). When a user decides to purchase a product advertised by the content provider, the user chooses the item to be placed in a shopping cart (Paragraph [0074]). At that point, the controller 109 obtains additional information on the chosen item from the content provider so that the user can access the additional information later (Paragraph [0075]). The user can then access that data base maintained by the controller (Paragraph [0080]).

Serial No. 09/766,646

However, Allibhoy does not cure the deficiencies of Hunt and Hoyle regarding "receiving, from the first user, designation information of a product provider which the first user permits to view the cart identification information and to view product information which the first user associates with the cart identification information, and which provides a product related to the viewed product information as well as additional information related to the viewed product information." There is no suggestion, nor even contemplation, in Allibhoy of the user allowing any product provider, including the provider of the item in the shopping cart, to view any cart identification information or product information associated with the cart identification information. Once the item is placed in the cart, the supplier of the item in Allibhoy is not authorized to view any product information associated with the cart identification information. Rather, the supplier of the item merely supplies additional information about that specific item when queried by the controller 109 of Allibhoy. The supplier is not authorized to take any proactive role in viewing the cart identification information and supplying the additional information, because the user does not permit the supplier to do so. As such, there is no designation information of a product provider which the first user permits to view the cart identification information and to view product information which the first user associates with the cart identification information.

Also, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not identified any such designation information in Allibhoy which designates that the user is permitting the product provider to view the cart identification information and to view product information which the first user associates with the cart identification information. Therefore, the Examiner has not identified all of the recited features of claim 1 in the cited prior art references. To wit, the Examiner merely stated that Allibhoy discloses the user designating which content providers the user will receive further information from. One skilled in the art can easily see that this is not tantamount to permitting a product provider to view cart identification information and to view product information. Therefore, no such permission is given to the product provider, and no such designation information applicable to the product provider is given to the server. For at least this reason, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Further, claim 1 of the present application, as amended, also recites "determining whether the received additional information is from the product provider which the first user permits to view the cart identification information and to view the product information associated with the cart identification information." As stated above, no such permission to view the cart identification information is given to the product provider in Allibhoy or the other cited references,

Serial No. 09/766,646

because the recited designation information is not given to the server. Therefore, none of the cited references disclose or suggest any such determination based on the user's permission. For instance, Hoyle discloses that banner advertising is supplied based on demographic information and data supplied by users during registration with the service, among other data gathered during computer usage. Therefore, the service in Hoyle is not notified of the cart identification information and product information, and thus cannot check any such information to determine an authorized product provider. In other words, none of the cited references disclose or suggest determining whether the received additional information is from a product provider which the first user permits to view the cart identification information and associated product information. In particular, the controller of Allibhoy merely extracts the additional information from the product provider, who is apparently completely unaware of any such cart identification information or associate produce information.

Therefore, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least the recited features of claim 1 discussed above. For a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must combine to disclose all of the recited features. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Independent claims 11-12, 14, and 21-23 recite similar features to those discussed above, and which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-12, 14, and 21-23 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 15-20 depend from claim 14, and claims 24-26 depend from claim 23. These dependent claims include all of the features of their respective independent claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15-20 and 24-26 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Serial No. 09/766,646

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims 1, 11-12, 14, and 21-23 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-12 and 14-26 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

01/19/07

By:

Thomas L. JonesThomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being trans-
mitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 01/19/2007
By: STAAS & HALSEY Thomas L. Jones
Date: 01/19/07